

REMARKS

The Examiner's Action mailed on October 7, 2008, has been received and its contents carefully considered. Additionally attached to this Amendment is a Petition for a One-month Extension of Time, extending the period for response to February 9, 2009.

Claims 1-14 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 5 and 6 are amended. Claims 1, 5 and 6 are independent. Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that various portions of independent claims 1, 5 and 6 are unclear. The above enumerated claims are amended to overcome the pending rejection under §112, as further discussed below.

The Office Action asserts that the terms "super junction structure" and "laterally arranged in alternate relation" are unclear. These terms are deleted to further clarify the subject matter of the pending claims. Further, the pending independent claims are amended to recite that the drift layers and the RESURF layers are disposed adjacent to each other in a direction parallel to the semiconductor substrate, each RESURF layer is in contact with at least one of the drift layers, and each of the drift layers is in contact with at least one of the RESURF layers. As shown in the exemplary embodiment of Fig. 1 in the disclosure of this application, a drift layer 3 and a RESURF layer 9 may be

disposed adjacent to each other in a direction parallel to a semiconductor substrate 2. Fig. 1 also shows that each RESURF layer 9 may be in contact with at least one of the drift layers 3, and that each of the drift layers 3 may be in contact with at least one of the RESURF layers.

The Office Action asserts that the location of a RESURF layer relative to a trench is unclear. The independent claims are amended to recite that each RESURF layer is disposed adjacent to an interior side wall of the trench. As shown in Fig. 1 of the disclosure of this application, a RESURF layer 9 may be disposed adjacent to an interior side wall of a trench 4.

The Office Action asserts that the relationship between the drift layer and the "isolation region" is unclear. Claim 1 is amended to recite that each drift layer has an isolation portion disposed between a RESURF layer and the semiconductor substrate. As shown by way of example in Fig. 1 of the disclosure of this application, a single drift region 3 may include a first portion 3_H disposed between a trench and a RESURF region, and an isolation portion 3_V disposed between a RESURF region and a semiconductor substrate.

The Office Action asserts that the general location of the RESURF layer within the structure of the semiconductor layer 13, with respect to method claims 5 and 6, is unclear. Claims 5 and 6 are amended in accordance with the above discussed amendments to claim 1, where appropriate, in order to further clarify the subject matter recited in those claims.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of claims 1-14 is definite under §112. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending rejection of the Office Action under §112 are respectfully requested.

It is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Such action, and the passing of this case to issue are requested.

Should the Examiner feel that a conference would help to expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned counsel to arrange for such an interview.

Should the remittance be accidentally missing or insufficient, the Director is hereby authorized to charge the fee to our Deposit Account No. 18-0002, and is requested to advise us accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,



February 9, 2009
Date

Robert H. Berdo, Jr. – Reg. No. 38,075
RABIN & BERDO, PC – Cust. No. 23995
Telephone: 202-371-8976
Fax: 202-408-0924

RHB/ARK/klc